THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 3.] THURSDAY FEBRUARY 27, 1919. [No. 19.

The Hindu Message stands for
(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,
(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,
(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,
(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and
(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.
Postage As. 13. Extra.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

ASVATTHA.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

On million Platforms tall and godlike grows
Th' Asvattha tree that talks with bending skies
And whispers unto God in paradise
with loving heart and world-commanding brows
Man's long unceasing tale of heartless blows,
His sundering of God-created ties,
His dark self-planned and hellward enterprise
On which God's prospering grace ne'er gladly glows.
The green-leaved pure *margosa* by its side,
It stands bright victor o'er all-conquering time
The shrine and symbol of auspiciousness.
Whatever be the fortunes that betide
This sore-tried but most fair and God-filled clime
May'st thou here always stand and shine and bless.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 27, FEB., 1919.

India and the International Covenant.

We have frequently expressed the opinion that the present and future of India would not be affected, except indirectly and remotely, by the provisions of the World's "Covenant of Fraternity and Friendship," as President Wilson calls it in the sonorous language which he is prone to adopt and to which we have become accustomed during these last few months. India forms part and parcel of the organism of the British Empire. Hence our destiny is interwoven with that of the whole of which we form a part, and it is the imperial organism *as a whole* that enters into the league. This is made clear by the fact that the Executive Council of the League is to consist of the representatives of the United States, *British Empire*, France, Italy, Japan, and four other states who shall be selected by the delegates. Of course, there is the larger body consisting of the representatives of the covenanting parties. But even here the delegates of the British Empire, whether they represent the United Kingdom or any of the Dominions or Dependencies of the Empire, will act only as the representatives of the British Empire. It is stated in the draft of the Covenant now circulated over the world that admission to the League is to be confined to "fully self-governing countries including Dominions and Colonies." This seems to exclude India from the League. But even the Dominions and Colonies who are included within it and will send their own representatives cannot, we believe take a course of their own apart from the Empire of Great Britain. The presence of their representatives in the assembly of the League of Nations or its Executive Council will only help to add weight and value to the voice of the Empire, and give that voice, an ascendancy in the deliberations of the League to which it is justly entitled, but it cannot give a special advantage to the Dominions and Colonies which the Empire as a whole cannot share though it may add to their dignity in the eyes of the world. India may not have the right to send a representative to the League, but Great Britain may nominate an eminent Indian as one of her representatives, and then he will have the same position as any other representative of the Empire of Great Britain, though that position will not bring to India the sentimental advantage and the impression of dignity which we have above spoken of as appertaining to a representative of the British Dominions and Colonies. The Draft of the Covenant also refers to "the maintenance of a just and scrupulous respect for all Treaty obligations in dealing, as organised peoples, with one another." India has no such treaty obligations; but the Dominions and Colonies have no such treaty obligations too. Hence, so far as this topic is concerned, we have nothing to complain about. But, we have to wait till we gain the status of a "fully self-governing country," in order to attain to recognition by the world as worthy of a place—and an honourable place—side by side with the world's civilised communities. Such attain-

ment we have to seek from Great Britain alone and not from the nations now covenanting to form a World-League. We have nothing to gain by appealing to President Wilson, or to anybody else,—whether an individual or a community—for help and sympathy. We have to convince the "predominant partner" in the *League of the British Empire* that we deserve self-government, and then we gain a higher status among the world's communities, as it were, by one leap,—by a stroke of the pen or by an Act of the Parliament of Great Britain. This we can attain only by a united effort on the part of the Indian Communities. So long as our leaders will not frankly communicate with each other and endeavour to arrive at a common understanding and aspiration, India will not attain to a higher status than she has now, and self-government will remain a dream, or the futile aspiration of a few ardent or ambitious individuals.

What we have said above is not intended to show that India has no interest in the organisation of the League of Nations or will not derive any substantial advantage from it. We fully believe that the constitution and working of the League will develop among the nations of the world a higher standard of international duty than that now prevailing. President Wilson has pleaded for "impartial justice, no matter whose interest is crossed," at the "peace table." If at the peace table, why not also later? As impartial justice becomes more and more the standard of international dealings, the position of India as part of the organism of the British Empire is sure to be revised in accordance with the same ideal and standard. We think that the conscience of humanity will be made to work at a higher level if the new League of Nations is brought into working order and fulfils the functions which it undertakes. The British conscience, too, will partake of this higher level of ethical aspiration and attainment, and India's future appeals for justice will obtain a larger and more speedy recognition than in the past. In the *second* place, the efforts of the nations in the future will be devoted to the production of food, clothes, and articles of beauty and comfort, and not to the bringing into existence of the means and implements of destruction. Whether or not the League of Nations will be useful in putting an end to *undue* competition of economic forces and resources, we cannot say. But we have no hesitation in saying that there will be a great increase of production in the world of articles useful and necessary to man in the sense above stated and there will be also a vast increase of trade. If all these results are achieved consistently with an increase of co-operation among the nations and without the economic ruin of communities in any land or nation through merciless economic competition, India will have every reason to congratulate herself on the formation of the League. The genius of India is not in the direction of combative competition, but of what the late eminent Indian scholar and thinker, Professor M. Rangacharya, once termed, in happy phrase, "conciliatory co-ordination." Our interest lies, therefore, in the successful working of the League of Nations now started and its endeavour to put down the destructive forces which make for war among the world's peoples. Every Indian, and especially every poor

Indian, suffers day after day the enormous evils arising from the recent world war,—the evils of deficient facilities of transport and the scarcity of the most necessary articles of food and dress. All Indians, therefore, must welcome the League of Nations, if it will put a stop to strife among men and thereby bring about a higher level of material prosperity and a substantial increase of supplies of all kinds of articles throughout the world.

We fear, however, that, in the immediate future at least, there will arise an economic competition among the world's communities whose results will be more ruinous to the weaker among them than even the destruction due to the militant civilisations of the past and the frequent wars to which they were addicted. The law of struggle is one of the animating forces in human nature, and cannot be quelled altogether except in a few higher natures attuned to the realization of the unity of existence which is behind all the phenomenal manifestations of the material universe,—of the inner joy of Love which transmutes, when once we lend ourselves to its enchantment, even the sorrows and sufferings of the world into their opposites and enables us to suffer them gladly in order to help humanity forward to a higher life and destiny. If economic competitions from the West is unchecked, India may find herself placed in an intolerable position of destitution and helplessness at an early future date. The new League of Nations and Great Britain must guard us and other Eastern countries similarly situated from being ruined by this substitution of economic for military aggression by the communities of the West. India wants self-government chiefly to protect, develop, and strengthen her industries and thus to offer to her sons the necessary material *elements* of a contented and cheerful home and social life. In the West, workers are agitating for a minimum of wages sufficient to enable every one among them to marry, to live in a decent house, and to bring up a family of normal size in a state of physical efficiency. They want, also for women similar opportunities to those of men to enter all professions and industries and receive equal pay for equally good work. They want, also, houses constructed with accommodation suited to the present rising standard of comfort among workers, and they want both Government and Local authorities to undertake the organisation of the measures needed. They want that every necessary step should be taken to reduce the amount of unemployment —which, at present, is stated to amount only to 5 per cent of the workers—and to make adequate provision for universal and compulsory insurance against unemployment,—i. e., to make arrangements so that each industry may make adequate provision that unemployed persons may be in receipt of an income which, though less than what they would earn while at work, will be enough to save them from starvation and its consequences. They also want that Government should legislate so as to dispense with all work before breakfast and to establish an all-round eight hours' working day. If the Western state can and ought to undertake these tasks, why should India be left to go its way and its people to suffer the frowns and arrows of fate or chance under the exploded regime of laisser-faire ? It is time that our public men should tackle with

the coming problems of Indian economic life and should ensure to our labouring classes the elements of a tolerable family life and enable them to form a strong and healthy part of the Indian democracy of the future.

"Is India Civilised" by Sir John Woodroffe.

VI. Conclusion.

Such are the main ideas and teachings contained in Sir John Woodroffe's valuable work which must be a daily joy and inspiration to all Indians if they are to be worthy of their past, realise themselves fully in the present, and usher in the great and glorious future that is to be. It is only when India shall be fully herself again that she will be able to inaugurate the reign of peace and mercy and love all over the world by the sovereignty of her spirit. Sir John says well: "Conflict will never cease until the reflection of the Great Peace is shrined in the hearts of men." The co-operative stage of civilisation based on the Indian conception of life is the only medicine for the ills of individual as well as social life. Sir John says: "Perhaps in a future co-operative stage of evolution each people will be left to work out its own appropriate evolution according to what in India is called svadharma." The salvation of the world does not lie in a league of white nations or in the mandatory theory or in the trustee theory. These are all near or distant cousins Jingoistic imperialism which has long convulsed the world with terrific wars, periodically blighting all the fairest flowers of civilisation in the garden of human life. No, India must teach the world again to reform individual and social life on the basis of unity in diversity and of co-operation and love if humanity is to resume its interrupted march God-ward and realise the raptures and perfections of love.

Hence the foremost duty of India to herself—aye, to the world also—is to be herself. If India herself is to become subdued in soul and a mere replica of the West, what is to become of the hope of the world? She must preserve her *svabhava* (स्वभाव) her essential nature. Otherwise she will enter the *durbar* of the civilisations of the world as a beggar and not as a sovereign by the divine right of love.

For this purpose we must have what Sister Nivedita beautifully called Aggressive Hinduism. Hinduism must become aggressive not in the path of conversion or in the path of abuse of other religions but in the path of dynamic self-realisation, self-conservation, and self-expression. Our boys and girls must live and move and have their being in it. Any scheme of studies which does not give it the most prominent—nay, overshadowing—place is a traitor to the sovereignty of spirit in the world and a mortal foe to the full self-expression of the soul of India. All other reforms—social and political and educational—are as trifles in comparison with this, the most important and basic and divine of them all. It is the key to all our national achievement in every realm of life and activity. We have now thrown the key away and are fumbling helplessly at the keyhole.

Let those who within and without our fold seek to ruin us by effecting individual and social transformations of all sorts and degrees of un-Indianness remember that they are engaged

in a helpless and hellish task though they may by their foolish actions put off the day of the triumphant re-assertion of the soul of India. Sir John says well : "Some Westerns now realise that though their inventions and their forms may be readily accepted, the spirit of the Eastern remains ; and that, no matter how many eternals may be altered, men retain certain unalterable qualities and ideas which are rooted in climate and environment; *and more deeply* (*I may add*) *in their inherited Sangskaras.*" Let us remember always that in these *samskaras* of ours is treasured up the eternal vitality of our race. Let us be very loyal to them and look at the world with the bold eyes of one who is in possession of the eternal treasure of life and to whom the world must come for life's truest and sweetest treasure.

Pramatha Nath Bose has well divided human civilisation into three stages—predatory, intellectual, and spiritual. It is a mistake to suppose that the spiritual man has neither strength nor intellect. The higher is the fulfilment of the lower. The spiritual man has strength with self-sacrifice and intellect with love ; and in him strength and intellect fulfil themselves and attain a higher and a fuller harmony and perfection. Let India regain her full and triumphant spirituality. Once again will the achievements of strength and intellect come to her feet seeking the gracious look of her love-lit eyes.

The illusions of New India—to borrow another of Mr. P. N. Bose's illuminating phrases—are many and grievous. We are like those who fight in the dark. There are the din of clashing swords and the piteous cries of slain ideals. Let but the light of spirituality dawn upon us again and then with clear vision we shall march forward as one man. India's wondrous theme has been the search and attainment through individual discipline and social stability and purity the lotus feet of god. Let us always remember Sir John Woodroffe's wise and noble concluding words : "The chief religious and philosophical concepts of India are in their essentials imperishable. These essential ideas will then in any case remain because as humanizing man for the spiritual end which they place before him, they are those of a great and true Civilisation."

Notes and Comments.

New religions and new prophets rise like mushrooms in Modern England, and in other European countries. Mr. H. G. Wells has proclaimed a new religion in his new book, "God, the Invisible King"—and we are indebted to Mr. Crozier for a brief account of it in his new volume of essays. Mr. Crozier informs us, in the first place, that he thought that "his (Mr. Wells') God must be none other than Jesus Christ Himself—redressed as it were." He continues regretfully :—"But I was mistaken. For when Mr. Wells came in from the side-wing of the stage, with a pointer in his hand, to explain the particulars of this new God of his own creation —the "Invisible King"—he said definitely that for one and another reason which we would find in his book, Jesus Christ could in no sense be allied to his own God, or have anything to do with Him, let alone be identified with him."—

* * *

Mr. Crozier tells us why Mr. Wells "would not have Him,"—and that is that Jesus Christ "lacked courage and manliness, and that he drooped his head on the cross and expired with 'My God ! My God ! why hast thou forsaken me' on his lips." Mr. Wells explains fnrther :—"The accepted figure of Jesus in the Churches

R. Krishnaswami Sastri

instinct with meek submissiveness is not in the tone of our worship." "The drooping pain-drenched figure of Christ, and the sorrowful cry to His Father jar on our spirits." "No crucifix or praying to a pitiful God for us, but rather that we should show God with a hand or a foot torn away from its nail and with eyes not downcast, but resolute against the sky." Mr. Wells wants in his own God, "a face without pain, the pain lost and forgotten in the surpassing glory of the struggle and the inflexible will to live and prevail. We do not care how long the thorns are drawn, nor how terrible the wounds, so long as He does not droop." How, after all this, the Bishop of Birmingham could say that Mr. Wells is "not far from the Kingdom of God" is passing strange! Mr. Wells sums up his view of Jesus by saying,—"When we cease to worship Him, we can begin to love Him," for "He is a saint of non-resistance." "It is not by suffering that man conquers, but by fighting."

***

How does Mr. Wells define his own God? The "supreme characteristic" in Mr. Wells' God is "courage." *Secondly*, "Mr. Wells makes him as handsome as Apollo himself." *Thirdly*, "Mr. Wells gives him his last finishing touch, in his epithet,—"*lip-parted*." *Lastly*, his God is to be a mutiplex personality:—"all those who were to be his new God, were to be personally and individually 'converted men in our religious sense of the term." Mr. Wells explains *conversion* as follows:—"This experience is an undoubtedly immediate sense of God, an absolute certainty that one is not alone by one's self." "Closer He is than breathing and nearer than hands or feet;" "and our lives are changed," "We are assured then that there is a Power that fights with us against the confusion and evil within us as without," and then "there comes into the heart an essential enduring happiness and courage."

***

From the above account it is easy to see how the war is influencing the cultured Britisher's conceptions of religion and God. God is courageous, handsome, lip-parted, and a multiplex personality composed of religiously converted men with an immediate sense of God and conscious that one is not alone by one's self, but in similar company. In our view this amounts to saying that God is nothing but the valiant British citizen army of today. It is this great institution that has vanquished the barbaric host of Huns who threatened to overwhelm the British race and its empire in ruin. Mr. Wells cannot be blamed for elevating it into his God,—if we have rightly understood him from Mr. Crozier's summary and extracts. We do not understand, however, why Mr. Wells should make his God "lip-parted." Is it to show that he is eager for conquests,—for fresh fields and pastures new to colonise, to develop, and to exploit for the advantage of the Empire? In our view, Mr. Wells represents the spirit of the age, and his work ought to prove an interesting study. But why does he call his God "Invisible" and "Veiled"? Again, how can God be composed of men who have an immediate sense of God? Does Mr. Wells mean only that the men who compose God are conscious that they form God only *collectively*, not as individuals?—One thing, finally, must not be forgotten,—*viz.*, that Mr. Wells means his God to be "finite" and "with a beginning;" and hence he is opposed to the Christian conception of the Holy Ghost working through all the ages.

***

We would in conclusion, quote Mr. Crozier's "summing up" of Mr. Wells New Religion.—"Practically, it consists of two main elements only; the one of recent date, the other as old as Christianity. The first is the Religion of Humanity of Comte; the other the personal Conversion of the Christian Church in all ages, of the Salvation Army and its street corner converts, all of whose experiences are told simply that we cannot doubt them." Mr. Crozier also explains "the relation which is to exist between us and Mr. Wells' God"—"It is not to be like that of a mother for her child." And why? A mother's love is only "instinctive and self

indulgent in its self-sacrificing." It should rather be, he insists, "like the love of a Captain for his men,"—"a love which will not hesitate to send them to torment and bodily death."

Marriages made easy.

[BY V. MAHALINGA AIYAR M.A.]

(Concluded.)

The doctrinal value of Caste is denied by those who have not studied Hinduism from its inside, but who have dipped into it in order to find pearls of passages which isolated from their context might corroborate their westernised notions. This denial is worthless. The disciplinary value of caste is derided by those who have felt its shackles heavy, who are unable to endure its discipline, not by those who are superior to discipline but by those who are unequal to it. This denial is interested, selfish, the result of weakness; and therefore worthless.

The Poet next says that Hinduism was in the past most accommodating in the mixtures of castes. He would be apparently satisfied if the Hinduism of to-day be as flexible as of yore. But Hinduism of yore stuck to castes; and there could be no mixtures of castes, unless there were castes as well. And in respect of these, it was distinctly recognised that they became a separate caste with very restricted rights to the family property. We shall follow up that tradition; and let it be enacted that the members of the new fraternity and their progeny shall be a new Nirvarna clan with very restricted rights upon the property of the Savarna family to which they originally belonged.

The Poet next refers to the petrifying effect of an alien government. This is surely reversing the picture. The alien government has loosened, decomposed, rendered elastic as India-rubber, disrupted, confused, corrupted, so many features that it is startling to be told that there is petrifaction; there has been putrifaction rather. There has been disturbance all along the line; the fever of change is so high-strung that the decomposition is felt to be insufficient. For the Indian social Bolshevist, no change is enough. He wants the broom of freedom to sweep away all conventions.

The Poet next urges in a stately manner that those who want to marry outside their caste are seized with an invincible love for intellectual and moral freedom. Those who would be intellectually and morally as free as is intended here, are unfit to be Hindus. Hinduism, more than any other religion, certainly permits as much freedom of intellect as is at all desirable; that is, permits it as a means towards realisation of the truth; but Hinduism asseverates that it holds the truth within itself; it is to be reached by realisations in succession of different grades of truth. Hinduism permits freedom to think out the truth, the freedom to move from grade to grade of truth. It most certainly does not permit—what ought not to be permitted—that freedom which would say: "I feel this to be true just now. Therefore this alone is true. I invincibly love *this* truth, and hate every other. I invincibly love *moral* freedom also, freedom to *act* as I believe, and hate all restraint." Hinduism permits freedom of discussion, but not a final affirmance which conflicts with itself. Finally, Hinduism does not at all permit freedom from all study of Hinduism, and from all practice of Hinduism.

"But," says the Poet, "the community which goes beyond all limits of endurance, which takes every step to make it impossible for such men to live within its pale, the men who have the courage and honesty of their conviction, and are therefore best fitted to fight for truth and righteousness, are doomed to breed interminable generations of slaves." Here is expended much energy of condemnation and damnation. This sentence will prove once more that none are such utter victims as the victims of words, that no disease is so hopeless as the impudence of the pure and mere poet that strays beyond apprehensions in naivete, and expressions of naivete. The Hindu community, if it opposes Mr. Patel's Bill, becomes unendurable, that is the frightening suggestion. Who cannot endure its intolerance? Tagore's suffering is a derived suffering; the original suffering would be that of the young man or woman who wants to marry outside caste but is not permitted. This original suffering should be unendurable. This, of course, would be in proportion to the strength of the frustrated desire. What is the frustrated desire? There is a howling, a raging, a

tearing, a volcanic longing, to embrace in marriage a member of a different caste. This is balked; and this longing flows over in suffering. Consequence: the community is unendurable.

I refuse to sympathise with this sort of agony: and would not tolerate others sympathising. I daresay that there must continuously be myriads of cases of reduction of such volcanoes to dormantcy, arousing no pity. I have no objection to universal love, to a man's heart overflowing barriers of castes, frontiers of countries, limits of nationalities, races, creeds, cultures, even reaching animals, and reaching even that breadth of sympathy, when the heart is ineffably touched by the sight of an inanimate pillar which bears ungrudging the weight of a house on its head. But I cannot admire or sympathise with the love which will be satisfied only by cohabiting with the object of love; I cannot see or admire honesty, courage, freedom, and all that noble brood supposed by the poet and others to be involved in that exploit. If your love for a member of a different caste is so great, and at the same time true love, and not lust, prevention from marriage will give rise to the really ennobling drama in life. The avoidance of marriage will be a cure to whatever defect (lust) was in that love. The fire caused by friction in the progress of love will be a purifier. If the love is lust, it will perish by non-marriage, and it deserves to perish. If the love is lust, and would not perish by non-marriage, but leads to suffering then the suffering is deserved. If the love was not lust, it will endure; and nothing is lost. Nothing good will be lost by non-marriage. And the evil will be punished or extinguished.

And no calumny will be graver or falser than this one utterance of the poet will circulate: that the fellows who want to marry outside their caste are the elect among the Hindus. It deserves our most earnest repudiation; deserves instantaneous expulsion from circulation.

The doom of interminable slavery pronounced upon the Hindu community which opposes the bill, absolutely does not frighten me. If you make marriages easy, the relevant spring of heroism is at once dried up; and there is no disappearance (because there is no appearance in the first instance) of extraordinary fitness to fight for "truth and righteousness."

Here is a parenthesis very necessary; this is invited by the word "slavery." Who are the slaves? Those who easily fall a prey to the seductions of foreign culture and life, or who stand up with strong backbone for our own culture and life? Those who will avail themselves, owing to want of mastery over themselves, of the imagined flexibilities of Hindu society, or those who would stand by its Sanatana features and fight for them?

Apparently, the poet is deluded by specific instances, and is rushed head-long to the conclusion that the orthodox will be slaves. He is not cognisant of other specific instances. He will find in the Ashe Murder case the conspirators (of all castes) had the defence of the caste system as one of the principal planks in their platform. Tilak's propaganda was of the same fashion. The Hindu Conference has passed a resolution demanding immediate and full self-government. Pandit Malaiviya's orthodoxy it is that has cut him from his moderate comrades. Sir Sankaran Nair's fear of the Hindu University turning out a host of too robust patriots and political revolutionaries was most legitimate. In fact social conservatism and political revolutionism are perfectly consistent and cognate: in fact they alone are compatible in a subject nation or nationality. And it is when orthodox India deliberately enters the field of politics, the moment for India's freedom would arrive. Moslems, who are more orthodox than the Neo-Hindu, are now in; and that is why our politics have stiffened and strengthened, (as Prof. Sundararama Iyer most acutely foresees in the Hindu supplement). The slaves of foreign culture and foreign tuition (even in the matter of religion and sociology, not merely in the methods of politics and advertisement and so-called organisation, which is really mechinisation) will be proved to have been most slipshod, effete, laggard, haphazard and slavish, even in their demands for freedom.

Orthodoxy is now waking up; thanks even to Mr. Patel's Bill in part. It will soon be in its rightful place as the triumphant maker of the New India, which shall be new, not in new-fangled ways of marrying etc., but in its sovereignty.

There is no appeal to the foreign Government at all, by orthodoxy, when that Govern-

ment is required not to sanction the new bill. It is the wonderful *social reformist*, who in his supreme courage of conviction and honesty and anti slavery invokes the aid of that *foreign* government to amend *his native* Hindu society by making his marriage easy. It is he, the fervid and pellucid patriot, who ought to be ashamed at his invoking the foreign government to disturb his Hindu society. It is giving the foreign government a wider area to traverse than it has chosen to traverse in the past. It is inviting a further usurpation of sovereignty by the foreigner, taking a further step into slavery. It is degrading in its procedure, shockingly humiliating. It is prima facie condemnable; and in its possible further consequences absolutely damnable.

The poet's positing the Hindu's attitude to the Bill as the touchstone to our fitness for self-government disposes of the sincerity of his contentions altogether. It is exactly on a par with that wisdom which left the extra contribution by the Delhi Council to be voted upon by the non-official members. Orthodox Hindu Society will be disturbed very little if Svarajya is to be shelved on this issue.

If we want Svarajya at all, it is not merely that we may solve our good problems more satisfactorily. We want self-government, not for mere rice and dholl; but that we, a race apart, may be free to contribute our own peculiar candle to the general illumination of the human race. If we shed our peculiarities one by one, there is no raison d'etre for demand of self-government. No purpose will be served by governing ourselves. We should be incapable of doing anything unique; we have no right to be a we. A Hindu has nothing in common with other Hindus. What if there are European mirasdars or Indian mirasdars?

Babu Rabindranath complains that our society has become petrified under the foreign government. Let that be admitted: we have made no new advances under them. That is one supreme argument, *not* for change of society while yet it is under such petrifying influence, but a driving, urging argument for self-government. Is it not because Mr. Patel is afraid that even a slight Home Rule in India might not pass such a bill, that he makes insincere haste with the bill? If social changes are desirable, then let the Hindu society decide on the matter; and not a foreign, mixed, atheistic legislature, not even a Brahmo poet, though he be the poet-laureate of Asia. Is it not a mere shame that advocates of autonomy should have recourse to the legislature which they condemn?

The Hindu society is hampered in all its movements by the foreign government. The foreign government has endowed most superficial verbal culture in English with enormous prestige. The Hindu social sanctions are set at naught by the degenerate and vulgar; because these cannot be punished, the Hindu society which is powerless to punish, appears as a tainted society; and revolutionaries appear, with the gild of superior virtue (and they are superior to the degenerate unpunished members of Hindu society), and clamour for changes. They cry: "your society looks composedly on concubinage with women of other castes; but would not permit honest and courageous marriage. Fie on your society!" And prima facie the Hindu society is at a disadvantage.

But the Hindu society finds itself unable to punish the degenerate, because of the foreign government. If this hampering agency is removed or rendered innocuous that society will know what to do, will be evidently, as it is immanently the most superb society in the world. The orthodox now know how they have been hampered. They now know how a certain number of honest, courageous, righteous, elect folk even have got disgusted with its ineptitudes. They are now oppressed with the fear lest the foreign government should now take active steps to demolish society. If Mr. Patel's Bill gets to be passed, there is no doubt an era will open of most stormy politics.

The orthodox with all their ancient unconquered love of the past, with their pure and real patriotism, will tug mightily at the reins in foreign hands. Even if the bill does not get passed, the orthodox will feel the grievance of the revolutionary, will feel the origin of the intercaste thirst to lie, (*a*) in the education that was allowed to be with foreigners, and (*b*) in the impunity with which many a Brahmin was allowed to stuff his inside with mutton, and wash his inside with wine, will resume with all his ancient ardour and "flexibility" the search

for means to extricate the Hindu society from the peril of petrifaction or the alternative of mis-shapen destructive revolution; will endeavour to remove the hampering dead weight of a foreign, un-understanding, ignorant, beef-eating rule; will stave off the effects, false glamours, false prestiges ensuing from a shop-keeping might, will resume sovereignty in its soil, will come to its own, by hook, if not by hook, then by crook.

One thing is certain: orthodoxy has awakened, never to sleep again. It will energise freely; and its triumph is near, and will be complete. It has discovered the great truth: its philistinism has bred catilinas in its bosom. It will be henceforth neither Philistine nor Catiline; it will not be inertly steeped in a bovine immobile blank dream of the past, nor permit eager and headlong slavery to the three m's—the moment, the mode and the free-thinking, unthinking mob."

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA II.

(*continued.*)

नैनं छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि नैनं दहति पावकः ।

न चैनं क्लेदयन्त्यापो न शोषयति मारुतः ॥ २३ ॥

Weapons cannot cleave him; nor can fire burn him, Water cannot wet him, nor can air dry him away.

NOTES:

1. The Scripture describes the soul as अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथाऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्. The soul is without देशकालवस्तुपरिच्छेद

2. The main idea is that the soul is immaterial and eternal and cannot be affected by the forces of the material universe. A body may be burnt when the house where it is is burnt. But the soul within the house of the body is not burnt when the body is burnt.

अच्छेद्योऽयमदाह्योऽयमक्लेद्योऽशोष्य एव च ।

नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणुरचलोऽयं सनातनः ॥ २४ ॥

He cannot be cut to pieces; he cannot be burnt; neither can he be wetted by water nor dried by air; he is eternal, all-pervasive, firm, immovable, and beginning-less.

NOTES:

1. Sri Sankaracharya says that the Lord is repeating what has been already stated because the matter is difficult of comprehension.

2. Matter in its fundamental form is indestructible but it changes form perpetually. The soul is unchanging and indestructible. It is *Sachchidananda* whether one with *Paramatman* as the Advaitins say, or in eternal relation with him as the Visishtadvaitins say.

अव्यक्तोऽयमचिन्त्योऽयमविकार्योऽयमुच्यते ।

तस्मादेवं विदित्वैनं नानुशोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २५ ॥

He is not realisable by the senses, he is not realisable by the mind; he is immutable; therefore knowing him to be such, you should not grieve in regard to him.

NOTES:

1. As the soul has no material form, the senses and the mind cannot grasp it. विकार means change of form—सूक्ष्म, स्थूल etc.

2. If the mind becomes pure and steadfast, the full glory of the soul is reflected in it. दृश्यते त्वग्रया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः—

अथ चैनं नित्यजातं नित्यं वा मन्यसे मृतम् ।

तथापि त्वं महाबाहो नैवं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २६ ॥

Even if you regard him as constantly born and constantly dying, even then, O mighty-armed, you should not grieve.

NOTES:

1. The Lord merely adds here an argument on the assumption of the ordinary view being right. अथ shows that there is a change of topic.

2. The prevalent ordinary views are: the Buddhist view that the soul is born and dies every moment, the Charwaka view which identifies body and soul, the Tarkika view that the soul is eternal but is born with the *body and dies with it.*, the view that the soul is born with the body and dies with it though both are seperate, the view that the soul endures from Kalpa to Kalpa and then dies, etc. etc. etc. The Lord says that even according to

these views grief is absurd, because what is the use of grieving for the inevitables. Arjuna was afraid of sin and its future consequences. In the light of the above views there could be no future consequences. In the light of the really correct view the soul is eternal and pure.

जातस्य हि ध्रुवो मृत्युर्ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च ।

तस्मादपरिहार्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २७ ॥

Certain is death to the born and certain is birth to the dead. Therefore you should not grieve for what is irremediable.

NOTES:

1. This verse merely carries forward the idea of the previous verse. If the soul is born with the body and dies with the body and is then reborn with the body, this cycle will go on whether you will or not. Why then grieve for the inevitable.

अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।

अव्यक्तनिधनान्येव तत्र का परिदेवना ॥ २८ ॥

All the beings have an unknown beginning, a known middle, and an unknown ending. What ground is there for lamentation?

NOTES:

1. It is well said: अदर्शनादापतितः पुनश्चादर्शनं गतः He came from non-existence and has gone back there. That is what the spectacle of life shows to one who gazes on its outside. If we accept this, the Lord says that there is no ground for grief. These verses do not deal with the real nature of the soul, for that has been done already. The Lord says that even if we take the erroneous views of those who do not know the inner truth of things the attitude of grief is unreasonable and improper. From the next verse the interrupted exposition of the real truth is resumed and completed after a few other special appeals to Arjuna's chivalry and valour.

(*To be continued,*)

National Topics.

BY J. S. R. SARMA.

I. IS IT PATRIOTISM?

"Is it really patriotic, I ask, to depreciate, to despise and to denounce everything connected with your country, with your countrymen, with your forefathers from time immemorial, everything connected with your religion, with your sociology, with, in short, everything your own? And yet you must admit that patriotism is a virtue necessary for self-preservation, self-contentment, self-love, self-respect, self-hope and self-progress. Pray, find out who taught you to abdicate the noble virtue of patriotism and to adopt its dismal contrary. If you find him out, erect for him a statue of the blackest marble or metal."—Raja Sir T. Madhava Row.

The question 'who taught' awaits an answer, and this comes prompt,—"the strenuous teachings of the modern missionaries of other climes and creeds, the destructive tendencies of modern education and the misdirected efforts of many radical reformers." In a word, this reprehensible unpatriotic attitude on the part of modern Hindu generations is the outcome of an ill-conceived spirit and system of alien education identified with the alien civilization much in evidence before us.

The late Raja again observes elsewhere: "It is a matter of great congratulation to India that her religion, her sociology and her political system possess so much solidity and rigidity as to resist all violent, whimsical, arbitrary, hasty and ill-considered changes. My feeling of congratulation is intensified in proportion as I contemplate the unsteadiness, the insecurity, and the chaotic and dangerous tendencies which prevail and are growing in Europe, and which the faulty system of English education in India is inspiring some of the educated classes with a desire to admire and imitate." "The conditions of sound progress," he observes in another place, "require that what exists must be vigorously defended by those *who know, appreciate and value it.*" The sting of the scorpion is in the tail. The force and significance of the foregoing extract lies at its end. Where are those who *know*, etc? Those who deprecate and despise the Hindu religion and sociology (which go together and are inseparable) are certainly, mostly those who, continuing to be nominal Hindus though, *do not know, do not care to know* and, nay *are determined to refuse to know.* Where is then their appreciation and valuing? The only sources of knowledge which have been ready made for them and

equally readily availed of by them are either the ready-made opinions of the perverse missionary and his perverted prosylete or convert whether partially or perfect; or those which spring "in response to the dim and dubious light of what he conceives to be his liberated reason." And what is the net result? "The process of imitation unavoidably leads to secession, and in secession we see the complete sterilisation of all effort for achieving social well-being." Imitation is bad by itself, and imitation of the bad is worse. It might as well give place to *emulation* which it is that is most needed at all at the present time.

What then as regards the efficacy of *reason*, the 'liberated reason'? I have had occasion, in an article contributed to the colums of 'the Message' some time ago, to estimate the value of 'reasoning' in relation to socio-religious points and scriptures as understood and propounded by the mighty Rishis of old. Here is a gift to the world—the opinions of the Raja again, of Herbert Spencer and Mr. Balfour. Said the Raja: "A few words to those who wish to set up their own reason as the sole guide of conduct in life and to discard social and theological rules. The age abounds with such persons. They scarcely seem to understand that individual reason is a very imperfect and erring guide and that principles and rules deduced from the knowledge and experience of previous generations are essential to human happiness. To such persons, I cannot explain the matter better than in the words of Herbert Spencer who says, '...... Were it possible to replace forthwith a traditionally established system of rules, supposed to be supernaturally warranted, by a system of rules rationally elaborated, no such rationally elaborated system of rules would be adequately operative. To think that it would, implies the thought that men's beliefs and actions are throughout determined by *intellects*, whereas they are in much larger degrees determined by *feeling*.' In a paper on 'courage of conviction' written some years ago, by an educationist, Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar, B.A., L.T., appears the following passage which bears on the point:—'Let not any man therefore confidently say that in working out a reform he is exercising the courage of his conviction. Individual reason cannot be permitted to mould of itself the convictions and practices of mankind as a whole. Where there is really so much difficulty in knowing certainly that our convictions are correct, as there is in the case of all serious social problems connected with the life and character of any great and long-lived civilization, it is safer to rely on the collective wisdom of the community as a whole than on the authority of the individual's reason. We cannot conclude better than by quoting from a chapter in Balfour's Foundations of belief where the author who is now the Prime Minister of England discusses at length the relative claims of authority and reason on the convictions and conduct of mankind. 'Suppose for a moment a community of which each member should deliberately set himself to the task of throwing off so far as possible all prejudices due to education; where each should consider it his duty critically to examine the grounds whereon rest every positive enactment and every moral precept which he has been accustomed to obey; to dissect all the great loyalties which make social life possible, and all the minor convictions which help to make it easy; and to weigh out with scrupulous precision the exact degree of assent which in each particular case the results of this might seem to justify. To say that such a community, if it acted upon the opinions thus arrived at would stand but a poor chance in the struggle for existence, is to say far too little. It could never even begin to be; and if by a miracle it was created, it would, without doubt, immediately resolve itself into its constituent elements."

I am not unaware that I have had to advert to the foregoing in a rather lengthy manner, the occasion being afforded by an article in some number of the 'Hindustan Review' which I happened to come across,—from the pen, of course, of a highly finished Hindu product, I believe, of modern universities. The writer, refering to social life in the Puranic age,' evidently delights in exposing what appears 'to the dim and dubious light of the liberated reason' to be meaningless rites and rituals enjoined by selfish and ignoble motives of the priesthood. He ridicules the system of religious gifts to Brahmins and the idea of merits accruing therefrom and of demerits and sins said to spring from their omission. The whole passage seems, *to a reason in bondage just like*

mine, to be conceived in a perverse and blasphemous strain. One wonders whether such unwarranted and mischievous denunciations of the Puranas and the Pouranic age universally regarded by all God-fearing Hindus as portraying the religions and ideals and customs of the Hindu Aryans constitute an act of *patriotism.* 'Is it patriotic, I ask'? The writer above referred to is nothing, if not a patriot in his own way, as otherwise he need not have worried himself about this kind of subject at all. But this patriotism is indeed of a peculiar type. Call it cynical, if you will, if he thinks that by rushing to print with such unworthy and unacceptable exposition of matters he is doing a great service to his countrymen, he is far wide of the mark. Such unpatriotic feats and effusions are of the nature of distinct disservice to the country.

A certain other University man—a high caste Hindu again, in his sketch on the life and time of Sri-Sankaracharya, is astonished to learn 'that he (Sri sankara) learned all the Vedas and Sastras in two or three years; by the eighth year of his age he had finished his course of studies!' and in his critical and discriminating reason, this is one of the 'tenth-rate and meaningless miracles.' Such touches and parantheses with a note of exclamation have a cynical note in them, and to say the least are quite unnecessary. How many instances are there of British poets who are said to have written and recited verses in very early ages of nine, thirteen and thereabouts and whose lives are yet chronicled faithfully by the British writers on English Literature with an evident sense and feeling of patriotic and legitimate pride? To our educated men of this calibre, the *Child Saint Dhruva* must all be a confirmed myth. Is this attitude, patriotic? I ask. Is the most recent performance of an Hon'ble Member of the Imperial Legislative Council in regard to Inter-Caste Marriages, again patriotic? I ask. Is the recently developed and daily developing attitude on the part of our women dabbling in the so-called politics and parading on platforms in the name of social reform and political progress and some blessed hackneyed phrascology or other, with glossy boots and dazzling specks, with waving kerchiefs and unbridled sarees in quite an un-Hindu and unfeminine outlandish fashion, is this patriotic? I ask. Is the attitude of our Holy Mathadhipathis, lethargic and indifferent and not alive to the sense of their duty as protectors and maintainers of the Religious and Sociological customs and ideals of the Hindu land, is it patriotic? I ask. Is the supineness of the Hindu Community at large, excluding if you will, that infinitesmal but noisy band of irreconcilable and incorrigible, denouncing and deformed, miseducated and liberated-reasoned worthies who wish to make the Holy hoary India a second-hand edition of the socially-chaotic and savagely-civilized Europe, paving the way for her being wiped out of existence as a *distinct, distinctive, unique* entity on this God's Earth; is this supineness, this policy of drift without taking steps to inaugurate and maintain corrective measures, is it patriotic? I ask.!!

Why not our so-called educated men take a leaf from the best book of the Westerners, and feel and show by their speeches, writings and acts, that they are proud of their race and religion, of their customs and sociology. Will they learn to *emulate*, not *imitate*, their brethren of the West? To emulate the virtues and substance—and not imitate the vices and chaff?

Shall we ever learn to think why the Britisher carries his pride and patriotism everywhere, why the humblest and highest among the Westerns adhere tenaciously to their habits of dress and taste whether in the tropic zones or torrid regions? Shall we ever learn to think that self-respect—both individual and national—counts very much to command regard and esteem by others, and that this self-respect stands to suffer a good deal by our ill-considered and unpatriotic acts on mistaken and illusory notions of political progress or what not?

Let us all remember that we, the Hindus, once powerful and glorious, now fallen from the highest summit, shall be true to ourselves, our ancestry and posterity and to our beloved country, only when we learn to uphold, to rejoice and revere whatever is our own from time immemorial, and to avoid to ridicule and reproach, despise and denounce it; Let us all take to heart the magnificent words of the late Justice Sir T. Muthuswami Aiyar, a truly great soul beloved of the community, the country, God and the crown alike.

"Never denationalise yourselves, never blush to own that you are Hindus, and never barter the influence which you possess among your countrymen and which you may exercise for their good, for the petty vanities of dress or taste. Remember what an eminent English Statesman once said: 'Before all things and above all things I am an English gentleman.' Be gentlemen in the sense in which the great statesman used the word."

Sanskrit and Modern culture.*

BY K. BALASUBRAMANIA AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

The subject I have chosen is, as you know, Sanskrit and modern culture. I confess I cannot deal comprehensively with it within the scope of this lecture and within the short time at my disposal. Nor have I the capacity to do justice to it. I shall content myself with indicating rather imperfectly how a study of Sanskrit must be a necessary concomitant of modern culture and how such a study must be influenced by modern thought. It is a fact to be noted by those who may despise ancient learning that Sanskrit works whether in the original or in the translation are read and referred to now-a-days.

Verily Sanskrit has become the Cinderalla of all parties and schools of thought at the present day. The Orientalist who devotes himself to the study of Oriental languages and necessarily chooses Sanskrit, being the most ancient of them, and then attempts his jaw-breaking exercises with it: the political traveller who prostitutes the study of Sanskrit to find out whether the country is civilised or not, or evolved the bold theory of the constitutional unfitness of Indians for self-Government: the Non-brahmin protagonist who, convinced of the age-long subjugation of his community, finds arguments for his theory of Brahmin oppression from the Manu Dharma Sastra, or Sastraic injunctions against Sudras learning the Vedas: the social reformer of the bolder type who re-inforces his argument for great social readjustment and the rooting out of mischievous social customs from a careful study of what he calls the ancient sastras as opposed to those of mediaeval times which he compares to the dark ages of Europe: the Social reformer "on National and rational lines," who in parishads and conferences attempts the difficult task of giving the right interpretation to Sanskrit texts and of reconciling or explaining away conflicting injunctions or establishing Sastraic authority for the mild changes of custom he advocates: the orthodox Hindu who imagines that the perfect society has been unalterably constructed for us by the ancient Rishis and that the social fabric of the Chatur-Varnya is a vital, strong and living one; which is sure to lead us to the millennium and must therefore be jealously guarded against the onslaught of the materialistic civilisation around him: the antiquarian, whether he be European or Indian, who constructs the ancient history of India, each from his point of view and reads it in books and stones: the Hindu Lawyer who interprets or comments on the Smritis: the Vedantist of the Vivekananda school with his "gospel of man-making" who holds aloft the torch of the Upanishadic religion of the धीर and अभीः and fondly speaks of the universal and essential principles of Hinduism: the Theosophist with his doctrine of the root and elder races and his esoteric principles of the astral plane and the Mahatma, who supports his theories from the sayings of the Rishis: the English-educated Hindu who turns in disgust from the materialism of modern life to the spirituality of his forefathers and comes to believe in the evening of his life with Vivekananda that "this is the land to which all souls must come wending their way to God": the devout and untutored Hindu who utters mantrams whose meaning he never cares to enquire or performs rituals which have long ago ceased to have any significance,—all these have to do with Sanskrit in some form or other. To this list I must add the philologist who occupies a very important position in our University. The reason for this position of Sanskrit is not far to seek. It is the storehouse of the experiences, spiritual, moral and social of ancient India and embodies in its literature and philosophy the bold speculations of our virile Aryan forefathers. Therefore it is that I say that the patriotic Indian who bestows his earnest attention upon the problems affecting his countrymen and does not find himself committed to any particular school of thought and at the same time approaches

---

* Being a lecture delivered at the Sanskrit Honours Association, Presidency College, Madras.

the question of the day with a keen critical faculty must have a solid cultural grounding in Sanskrit literature and philosophy. Sufficient emphasis has not been laid on the place which Sanskrit must occupy in the curriculum of the Universities of India. Oftentimes an unnecessary rivalry exists between Sanskrit and the living languages, the vernaculars and the claims of Sanskrit have occasionally roused the ire of the vernacular party who have mistaken them for reflections on the reputation of the vernaculars. I yield to none in my admiration and love of the living mother tongues, Tamil and Telugu. But as literatures embodying the ideas and ideals of our race they have largely been influenced by Sanskrit and exhibit marked internal evidence of the impress of Sanskrit. The Saiva Siddhanta of South Indian Thondars or the Prabandhas of Vaishnavite saints embody the reasoning and speculation of Advaitavada or Vishishtadvaitism in Tamil. Therefore I make bold to suggest that from the national and patriotic point of view Sanskrit must occupy the same place as English in higher education in our Universities. The difficulty of mastering such a highly, inflectional language cannot stand in the way of its being one of the compulsory subjects for the graduate course. The genius of Indians in mastering foreign tongues will surmount all difficulties. The Sanskrit language with its virility, dignity and sonorous harmony of sound is worthy of serious study by all lovers of language.

It is surely as Dandin calls it, the language of the Gods if ever gods speak any language. Nor can it be said of Sanskrit literature that the ideals therein preached are opposed to modern notions or that they cannot satisfy the yearnings of the modern citizen. Can there be a loftier ideal for modern humanity than that enunciated in the famous passage in the Upanishads,

तदेतदेवैषा दैवी वाक् अनुवदति स्तनयित्नुः ददद इति
दाम्यत दत्त दयध्वम्।

"This is what the heavenly voice thunders forth,—Attain Self-Control, Renunciation and Compassion." Are these not also the watchwords of a war-stricken humanity whose delegates have assembled at the Peace Conference? Can any one imagine a nobler ethical code for any public worker than that contained in the following verses in the 16th Chapter of the Gita,

अभयं सत्त्वसंशुद्धिर्ज्ञानयोगव्यवस्थितिः ।
दानं दमश्च यज्ञश्च स्वाध्यायस्तप आर्जवम् ॥
अहिंसा सत्यमक्रोधस्त्यागश्शान्तिरपैशुनम् ।
दया भूतेष्वलोलुप्त्वं मार्दवं ह्रीरचापलम् ॥
तेजः क्षमा धृतिश्शौचमद्रोहो नातिमानिता ।
भवन्ति संपदं दैवीमभिजातस्य भारत ॥

Will not the doctrine of Karma Yoga hold good at the present day as the highest principle of social service and service to humanity? Can there be a greater clarion call to courage and self-reliance than the teachings of the Upanishads?

(To be continued.)

Olla Podrida.

The birthday celebrations have begun again. Olcott has had his usual share of annual celebrity. Leadbeater also has had his birthday celebrated. Heaven knows why.

*
* *

A Mahadeva Sastri of Madras has been lecturing Hindu marriage away. The modern man has acquired and is displaying a new art—the art of talking a thing dead.

*
* *

The Bombay widow's home got 6 widows married last year. It refused to admit a widow because she was not able to get a certificate of character.

*
* *

The Muslim ladies' conference is now in a state of difference. Because the President chose a site different from that already selected, a split occurred. The ladies went into two camps and held two separate conferences. We are indeed in the very thick of democratic life. Confer and differ—these two words sum up modern life.

*
* *

The National Education week propaganda have begun. The 1st of April is coming. Let all the wise men get ready.

*
* *

One Mr. Sastri, M.A., is advertising for a bridegroom and two brides of the Mulaganadu sub-caste and wants them to be put into Post box No. 408. Will they have breathing space there?

SCRUTATOR.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.